

**From:** Richard Connor  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 3/8/03 3:45PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

BM-10641

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Richard Connor (rconnor@bizpress.net) writes:

Crucial decision looms  
Concerned citizens need to keep an eye on Washington's other Powell

BY RICHARD CONNOR  
Commentary

At a time when sabers of war are rattling all over the world, when our longtime allies are abandoning us and when the national economy continues to wobble, it is difficult to focus attention on other matters that are crucial to our country.

But while Secretary of State Colin Powell is making his case that the U.S. has ample justification to go to war against Iraq, his son, Michael K. Powell, sits at the center of one of the most important issues in this country today. We need to pay attention to not just one, but both Powells.

Michael Powell is chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. The commission, a panel composed of three Republicans and two Democrats, is scheduled to vote in May on a proposal to change what is known as the cross ownership rule. The rule prohibits ownership of a newspaper and a broadcast outlet in the same market and also limits the number of television stations the same company can own in one market. There are other aspects to the rule but those are the most essential.

Powell believes the rule should be relaxed and the floodgates opened to allow further consolidation of the media business.

Those who favor the rule change argue that there are more avenues for free speech and media competition than in the past particularly because of the Internet and cable television and that the rule is therefore outdated.

But that's like saying you can throw a thousand gray mice in a bag, shake them up, and when you dump them out you will have an elephant. These little pieces of the pie may look like media competition to the big boys but they are not. At best, they are distant relatives. The big money and power is still with the big companies, which will only grow bigger if the rules are relaxed.

Allowing one company to own both broadcast and newspaper properties in one market is a disastrous idea.

In our market, Dallas-Fort Worth, we have both a good example and a bad example of what I am talking about both in one company, A.H. Belo Corporation of Dallas. Belo is a great example of responsible cross ownership. But it is a bad example to use as an argument for doing away with the cross ownership rule because most owners do not adhere to Belo's high standards.

Belo owns both The Dallas Morning News and WFAA TV-Channel 8, the ABC affiliate. They are allowed to own both because the cross ownership rule was not in place when Belo acquired the properties and the company's dual ownership was later "grandfathered" as an exception.

Fort Worth's Amon Carter family similarly owned the Star-Telegram, radio stations WBAP and KSCS, and KXAS TV-Channel 5. My former company, Capital Cities Inc., acquired the newspaper and radio stations in 1974 but because of the cross ownership rule was not allowed to own Channel 5. The TV station was

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

sold to Lin Broadcasting.

Capital Cities later merged with ABC and Capital Cities/ABC was eventually sold to Disney, which in turn sold the Star-Telegram to Knight Ridder. Disney kept the radio stations.

During the years of cross ownership in this market, there were no apparent problems caused by one company owning both broadcast and newspaper outlets.

Belo television station and newspaper are run independently and exhibit the best practices of corporate ethics in the news and advertising business. Simply stated, the company does not abuse its power with either news sources or advertisers.

But Powell and his fellow commissioners will be making a serious mistake if they believe that Belo is the rule when, in fact, it is the exception. If consolidation occurs in this industry, we can expect dual owners of newspapers and television stations or owners of multiple TV stations in the same market to throw their weight around with alacrity. They will not have the self-control and patience and discipline of Belo, at least not the majority of them. And they most often will not be local owners with a sense of the communities where they do business.

The media giants of this country will consolidate and combine newspapers and television stations, narrowing the opportunities for diversity in news and opinion while opening the door to higher rates for advertising and subscriptions.

Virtually all revenue in the media business comes from advertising. Increased revenue particularly in the newspaper business but also in broadcasting comes not from market expansion but from raising advertising rates.

Profit margins in the newspaper business and in broadcasting can be hefty. Sometimes they approach 40 and 50 percent. It is not uncommon to find newspapers with profit margins of 30 percent or more.

These profit margins have grown over the last 20 years even as the number of advertisers and the amount of advertising have, by and large, decreased. How?

Higher rates and lower costs. And much of the cost reduction has come at the expense of jobs,

Have you noticed over the last decade that accolades most often go to those in business who have reduced headcount the number of employees as opposed to those who have created jobs and provided new opportunities for employment?

Unfortunately, Wall Street applauds only bottom line performance without examining how increased profitability is achieved and questioning the means to the end. But the federal government should be encouraging job creation, not job elimination.

Further consolidation in the media business will lead to higher advertising rates and fewer jobs. Companies will begin to spout one of the most overrated slogans in today's business jargon: synergy. They will talk about how much more efficient and useful they will be by combining the forces of print and television in one market.

That synergy may benefit stockholders but it won't help stakeholders those who work at these properties, those who advertise with them, and the communities they serve. We need more voices in our communities, not fewer.

Some of us can remember when many cities had at least two newspapers, and we remember that the competition made both papers better. All across the country, people decry the loss of competition and choice in newspapers.

The people who do not bemoan consolidation are the newspaper owners. It has allowed them to dominate their markets and operate without competition even though the owners point wildly to all the competition they face in the form of radio, television, billboards and direct mail.

I know the argument well. I used to make it.

Meanwhile, people such as Michael Powell will argue that the Internet and other technological advances have increased the outlets for news, information and advertising and that we therefore have more voices, not fewer, and more alternatives to traditional media.

This proliferation of alternatives is real, but all of the new outlets combined could not match the strength or influence of the media giants that control newspapers and television in major markets today.

Those conglomerates which they hate to be called wield enormous clout and power not only in the communities they serve but also in Washington, where their lobbyists have a loud voice and a strong arm.

The cries of the little people are rarely heard in the halls of government, where lobbyists and their messages almost always carry the day.

Smaller towns and cities will perhaps be most adversely affected if the rule is changed to allow one company or one family to own the local television station, radio station and newspaper. Advertisers and consumers in those towns had better hold onto their wallets. Their pockets are about to be picked.

That's the commerce side of the problem. Even more worrisome, though, is the other side the constriction of voices in the community.

Speaking about the possible rule change, Jeff Chester, executive director for the Center for Digital Democracy, said: "There will be fewer owners of media outlets in a community, and meaningful freedom of speech will rest in the hands of the few with tremendous political and commercial power."

If you want a glimpse of what the future might look like, consider this: How many news stories and editorials have you read dealing with the dangers of changing the cross ownership rule?

The media barons are already controlling information and possible dissent on this subject. They do not want your input.

If the rule is changed, we will have yet another weakened link in the chain of checks and balances in this country.

Last week, the FCC held a public hearing in Richmond, Va. Chairman Powell said it will be the only public hearing on this matter. More are not needed, he says, because the commission has heard from many people from all over the country, mostly via e-mail.

This attitude typifies why Powell's leadership on this subject is lacking. E-mail will never be a substitute for a face-to-face dialogue with the public on important issues. It is efficient but lacks the powerful context of emotion and personal attachment on a matter such as this. One public hearing on a subject of this import is ludicrous.

One of the two Democrat commissioners, Michael Copps, believes the rule change needs more study and more public input. **He** has promised to hold his own public forums on the subject this month in Seattle and in Durham, N.C.

Most observers in the media business believe the rule will be changed. Let's hope they are wrong. Let's hope that throngs of citizens will e-mail Powell with their objections, if that's how he wants to conduct the debate, and that Copps is able to gather momentum with his two public meetings.

Two weeks ago, one of the other two Republicans on the commission, Kevin J. Martin, put together his own coalition to defeat Powells effort to further deregulate the telephone industry. The commission retained rules designed to encourage competition.

Perhaps Martin will agree that newspapers and television need more competition than exists today, not less, and will assemble a coalition to retain the cross ownership rule despite the general movement in Washington these days to have fewer and fewer regulations on business.

Contact Connor at [rconnor@bizpress.net](mailto:rconnor@bizpress.net)  
[www.JohnRook.com](http://www.JohnRook.com)

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 66.82.9.23  
Remote IP address: 66.82.9.23

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** John Rook  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 3/8/03 3:35PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

AM-10641

John Rook (john@JohnRook.com) writes:

Not Kisses, HISSES..for other POWELL

Saturday, March 8, 2003

Backing, hisses for media consolidation

By TODD BISHOP  
SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER REPORTER

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Media executives and a passionate crowd of media consumers gathered in Seattle yesterday to discuss the prospect of big companies amassing even larger collections of TV stations, radio stations and newspapers.

More than **250** people showed up for the Federal Communications Commission field hearing held on the University of Washington campus. Many people in the crowd were decidedly against media consolidation -- some of them literally hissing whenever any large media conglomerate's name was mentioned.

The hearing, called by FCC Commissioners Michael Copps and Jonathan Adelstein, comes as the FCC contemplates relaxing its media ownership regulations. The rules under consideration include those that prevent one company from controlling more than 35 percent of the nation's TV audience; keep companies from owning TV stations and newspapers in the same market; and limit the number of radio stations one company can own in a market.

The court-ordered review by the FCC is expected to result in a decision this spring. FCC Chairman Michael Powell has said he expects the rules to be partially loosened.

"No issue pending before the Federal Communications Commission matches in importance the decision that we're going to make this spring," Copps said as he opened the hearing yesterday. "What we decide is going to have a formative impact on our media for many years to come."

Opponents of media consolidation say it results in diminished competition, homogenized news and programming, and a lack of attention to local people and issues.

In Seattle, the trend toward consolidation has been particularly evident in the radio industry, with large national companies such as Entercom Communications Corp., Infinity Broadcasting and Clear Channel Communications owning collections of local radio stations. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 loosened limits on radio ownership.

"Fewer and fewer entities are controlling what we hear, and the public airwaves are no longer serving the public," said John Sandifer, executive director of the Seattle local of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, during his testimony at the hearing yesterday.

But companies that support looser ownership regulations contend that it creates stronger media outlets better positioned to provide quality programming and news.

Dave Lougee, general manager of Belo Corp.'s Seattle TV properties, said the company's ownership of both KING/5 and KONG/16 has resulted in efficiencies that have freed resources to put into local news

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

coverage and programming.

Companies that support loosening or lifting ownership limits include The Hearst Corp., owner of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. In a January filing with the FCC, New York-based Hearst urged the commission to repeal the restriction on one company owning a newspaper and broadcast TV station in the same market.

Hearst's filing cited a study that concluded that television stations under common ownership with newspapers provide better local news coverage and programming than do TV stations whose parent companies don't own newspapers.

In Seattle, Hearst was mentioned as a potential buyer of KOMO/4 when its owner, Seattle-based Fisher Communications, was exploring options for its future, which included a possible sale of the company.

A vocal opponent of relaxing media ownership rules is Frank Blethen, publisher of The Seattle Times, which shares business functions with the P-I through a joint operating agreement. He spoke against common TV and newspaper ownership during the hearing yesterday, saying, "We do not need to own a TV station to survive."

Repealing that rule and relaxing others "would not only be a serious blow to America's independent free press -- it may be a fatal blow to our democracy," Blethen said.

Commissioners Copps and Adelstein, Democratic appointees to the FCC, both expressed concerns about media consolidation during their remarks at the hearing. Copps organized the Seattle hearing and another planned for North Carolina without the support of the FCC's Powell, who believed an earlier hearing in Richmond, Va., was sufficient.

In addition to testimony from politicians and media executives, nearly 50 people signed up to make public comments. Many criticized the local media and said further consolidation would only make the situation worse.

P-I reporter Todd Bishop can be reached at 206-448-8221 or [toddbishop@seattlepi.com](mailto:toddbishop@seattlepi.com)

[WWW.JohnRook.com](http://WWW.JohnRook.com)

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 66.82.9.38  
Remote IP address: 66.82.9.38

**EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
ORIGINAL**

From: John Rook  
To: Commissioner Adelstein  
Date: 3/7/03 2:28PM  
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

**RECEIVED***RM-10641***MAR 18 2003**

John Rook (john@JohnRook.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

This from Seattle Times reporter Bill Virgin

This whole thing has been amateur hour from the start. The Seattle hearing was announced several weeks ago, but there was no official announcement of the date until, as you say, three days ago. The list of participants wasn't even released until yesterday; we ran a story using a list that had apparently been given to one of the advocacy groups (the list was fairly accurate, although there were some changes).

-----Original Message-----

From: JHRook [mailto:JHRook@earthlink.net]  
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 8:10 AM  
To: billvirgin@seattlepi.com  
Subject: FCC hearing

Mr. Virgin,

The FCC hearings scheduled for today in Seattle weren't even announced until three days ago. We attempted to gain the names of the participants all three of these days by talking directly to the offices of both Mr. Adelstein and Mr. Copps in Washington, D.C.

It should be noted and both commissioners made aware that the results of fruit from this forum or hearing may be quite limited in few of the extremely limited time the public was notified.

We also suggested several panel members names and contact phone numbers to the FCC but were advised the panel had already been set, but again not names were given. Several group owned broadcasters refused to testify because they did not want to go on record for their personal negative remarks against further consolidation of the radio business. Concern of retaliation from their employers (Clear Channel) was the stated reason for not wanting to testify.

We recommended the name of one very well known and respected radio veteran, Pat O'Day, but was told again by the FCC the panel had already been chosen.

This is no way to hold an OPEN hearing for maximum response from knowledgeable radio people.

John Rook  
www.JohnRook.com  
Spokane-Coeur d'Alene

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 66.82.9.12

Remote IP address: 66.82.9.12



**ORIGINAL**  
**EX PARTE OR LATE FILED**

**RECEIVED**

**From:** dale reich  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 3/6/03 7:56PM  
**Subject:** Report of "Threat Against the President of the United States" VIA HAM RADIO

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hello:

*RM-10641*

Yesterday a multi-segment "copy" of a "Tape" of "Communications" that took place over the Medina County M2M Amateur repeater system was given to the office of "Pat" Guisman, Medina County Commissioner, Ohio.

This tape had a "Segment" in which a "Ham" from Medina County stated of sorts, a long time "R", was not happy with the "Bush" engery policy's. In the "Broadcast" he states to the effect to locate the president and "BACK SLAP HIM! At best this may only be a "Civil Protest" however in all facts of truth it's a "Threat" against the President of the United States. Witch can be a "Crime" even if a "Joke".

It is also a "Crime" in Ohio, and under my past "Oath's", not to report this [Current Oath's] also not to report this. So Above is my report.

Using "Ham" radio to make a "Threal" against the "presiednt of the United States" should have some action the COMMISSION should also be aware of in normal business.

Please feel free to Contact Me, for any information you may need. You May also contact the Medina Commissioners, 144 North Broadway, Medina, Ohio 44256 as they have a copy of the TAPE.

This Tape has various of "Political" remarks directed at various public officals in Medina County by various Licensed Ham Radio Operators. Under Communications Act of 1934 Code 605 or new revised Title 47 Code Section 705, Ham Radio Communications and Citizen Band are not protected by the various privacy and seceret act's.

There is a lot of Civil Protest listed, on this tape [Both Sides] and a number of "Radio Pranks" that have take place on the M2M ham radio club repeater that is supported by the Medina County Government through the Medina County Emergency Managenecy, The Federal **NOAA** Skywarn Program and various other related community projects in joint operations with the RED CROSS.

Comments that have civil portest have "Just Cause", This "Threat to Back Slap" the President is just a long string of "Civil Right" and "Federal" Violations, supported by the un-wise communications.

Copys of the Tapes went to "Key Democratic" County leaders, as they may find it funny how politcial attacks are "Broadcast" over the "Free" airways in Medina County on 147.030 Mhz, 51.660 Mhz, and 444.925 Mhz. In all fairness, The Medina County Government has "Supressed the political wrong doings of this "Supported" group of Hams.

You cant be "Threating the President", and in the next few days be conducting FEMA / EMA / EOC busienss acting in the good intent of the public. A lack of oversight, a lack of control, and a un-willing to act local government to "stop" this kind of conduct is the problem.

With Respect,

Dale E. Reich  
141 North Center St.  
Seville, Ohio 44273 - 9504

No. of Copies rec'd /  
List ABCDE

Telephone (330)769-3071 + lots of rings for machine if not home. No "ooo" "ppp" or "Blocked Calls".

CC: Business Attorney  
"Others"

MSN 8 with e-mail virus protection service: 2 months FREE\*

CC: exab8fq@hotmail.com

ORIGINAL RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MAR 18 2003

From: dale reich

To: Commissioner Adelstein

Date: 3/6/03 7:55PM

Subject: Report of "Threat Against the President of the United States" VIA HAM RADIO

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hello:

RM-10641

Yesterday a multi-segment "copy" of a "Tape" of "Communications" that took place over the Medina County M2M Amateur repeater system was given to the office of "Pat" Guisman, Medina County Commissioner, Ohio.

This tape had a "Segment" in which a "Ham" from Medina County stated of sorts, a long time "R", was not happy with the "Bush" energy policy's. In the "Broadcast" he states to the effect to locate the president and "BACK SLAP HIM! At best this may only be a "Civil Protest" however in all facts of truth it's a "Threat" against the President of the United States. Which can be a "Crime" even if a "Joke".

It is also a "Crime" in Ohio, and under my past "Oath's", not to report this [Current Oath's] also not to report this. So Above is my report.

Using "Ham" radio to make a "Threat" against the "president of the United States" should have some action the COMMISSION should also be aware of in normal business.

Please feel free to Contact Me, for any information you may need. You May also contact the Medina Commissioners, 144 North Broadway, Medina, Ohio 44256 as they have a copy of the TAPE.

This Tape has various of "Political" remarks directed at various public officials in Medina County by various Licensed Ham Radio Operators. Under Communications Act of 1934 Code 605 or new revised Title 47 Code Section 705, Ham Radio Communications and Citizen Band are not protected by the various privacy and secret act's.

There is a lot of Civil Protest listed, on this tape [Both Sides] and a number of "Radio Pranks" that have take place on the M2M ham radio club repeater that is supported by the Medina County Government through the Medina County Emergency Managenecy, The Federal NOAA Skywarn Program and various other related community projects in joint operations with the RED CROSS.

Comments that have civil portest have "Just Cause", This "Threat to Back Slap" the President is just a long string of "Civil Right" and "Federal" Violations, supported by the un-wise communications.

Copys of the Tapes went to "Key Democratic" County leaders, as they may find it funny how political attacks are "Broadcast" over the "Free" airways in Medina County on 147.030 Mhz, 51.660 Mhz, and 444.925 Mhz. In all fairness, The Medina County Government has "Supressed the political wrong doings of this "Supported" group of Hams.

You cant be "Threating the President", and in the next few days be conducting FEMA / EMA / EOC busienss acting in the good intent of the public. A lack of oversight, a lack of control, and a un-willing to act local government to "stop" this kind of conduct is the problem.

With Respect,

Dale E. Reich  
141 North Center St.  
Seville, Ohio 44273 - 9504

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

1

Telephone (330) 769-3071 + lots of rings for machine if not home. No "ooo" "ppp" or "Blocked Calls"

CC: Business Attorney  
"Others"

---

MSN 8 helps ELIMINATE E-MAIL VIRUSES. Get 2 months FREE\*

CC: exab8fq@hotmail.com

ORIGINAL

RM-10641

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

From: dale reich  
 To: Commissioner Adelstein  
 Date: 3/5/03 3:23PM  
 Subject: RM-10641 -Updates / Remarks .... Gun's & Radios

Federal Communications Commission  
 Office of the Secretary

Hello:

Well I've take a lot of "Flack" from the "Ham" & "CB Community about RM-10641 involving the point of sales & tagging of radio equipment.

I spent several hours from one caller from the west coast who had strong "objections" to both of my RM's that have been posted. This fellow used the "F" word in his communications about every 20 th word or so! I have no objection to his " F word in print, oral communications from anyone using it. [Over the Broadcast Media, or Involved in Radio/TV] I do have objections to its use.

This fellow who was highly upset that his "RM were not acted upon, was shocked as How Easy I could get my "RM's past the "Commissioners & Bureau Chiefs's of the FCC, with out being sent back.

He spent most of the time speaking of my GRAMMAR, and SPELLING'S as I have a "Small to Severer" "H" Handicap in communications, and this is nothing new to me. The fact that I use a Library Computer and the "SpellCheck" will not work on all the terminals also upset him. The Library "Filters" block access to functions, some time will not work, and other time's lose DRAFTS of messages.

This fellow hammered upon me for more than 2 hours about my "RM, but my goal in talking to him was to find out his "Gripes". The fellow who would not calm down, stated I mixed up past history a bit, and also mixed it with my future proposals in the "RM" request for changes. Well "History has a point of VIEW and all people don't see history as a "Fluid" for of "Solid Science" of TRUTH, or FACT.

Searching this fellows remarks from what little I could pry out his "Hate" for the "Commission" and any thing that would abridge his 4th Amendments Rights to Have Gun's or Radio's! Makes Me think of his "Convolutd judgment. This fellow should have addressed my rite's under the 1 st & 5 th Amendments [For or Against] a issue

This fellow ask if I had any other "RM" that were pending, and I told him I would suspect that there are about 13 or so on the desk marked "Hold [By the commission] that are wide request issues to bring back some control of a out of control or non-control way the WTB and other FCC bureaus have so "Deregulated radio that the "Commission" failed to protect the public with a pattern of non-enforcements! [OF SORTS] !!!

I told him that some of the not posted or not pending "RM's" setting on hold were far to complex to ever pass! This fellow demanded I have them "RECALLED and not posted he was upset! I told him I don't expect recall them, and gave him a outline of some of the items.

He did not have kind word for Mr. Riley "William" Hollingsworth, Gettysburg Office, enforcement chief of Part 90, 95, 97 and other sub-parts of the Licensing Bureau of the FCC.

I told him of the "Enforcement" issue that the FCC was engaging in by returning my complaints, as well of "Scores" of other Complaints that the commission has not the Money, or Time to address. Several rounds of over the air complaints including operators from 80 through 10 meters who "stuff has been returned, and not acted upon. The commissions "Token Enforcement" program is at present "Cost Effective" they feel as if it is "adequate", however in not logging the complaint with a "Case Number" and returning it looks as if the "FCC Staff is doing a BANG UP JOB, and every ones happy. This is far from the TRUTH.

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
 List ABCDE

With Regards to the "RM-10641" perhaps the commissioners could consider this request to be applied to "Selective" enforcement area of the need-ed radio services that requires remedial enforcement protection of the public's needs!

With Respect, Thanks

Dale E. Reich  
141 North Center St.  
Seville. Ohio 44273 - 9504

Telephone (330) 769-3071 + Lots of Rings long walk to phone.

Add photos to your messages with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE'

CC: [ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us](mailto:ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us)

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MAR 18 2003

**From:** dale reich  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Thu, Mar 13, 2003 12:24 PM  
**Subject:** Relating to RM-10641 - Data Sent Via regular mail - No Return Address - No Name

ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hello: Commissioners

I have just sent in a common business envelope a enlarged photo copy of a "Business Card" bold statement about buying CB Linear Amps. This is a CB shop.

Violations of various subparts 2 - 95 - 97 of the CFR Title 47 and other parts.

I have several pending "RM's" setting on the control desk, that would take care of some of the "Enforcement" issues regarding the "Illegal" and "Export" radios unlicensed radio **use**.

More and More "FRS and "MURS stations are coming on the air every day, that exceed the "Short" range or Ultra Short Range" of the service intent. Radios in the new services can be monitored some 60 miles away, when the normal profile is 2 miles. This is not a "line of Sight" issue like some station on a big HILL!

RM-10641

Programmable high power radio equipment, HAM & COMMERCIAL +110 Watt Linear Amps are becoming very common on "FRS - "GMRS and "MURS un-regulated radios.

Printed rule books, for each radios service should be included in the point of retail sale of "CB - "GMRS" - "FRS - "Aviation" - "Marine" - "Business" and the "MURS" radio services.

A license is a "Contract" with the "Government" of the "Ye-old days of the past era when the FCC required CB licenses. When a "Signed" application was sent in the "Contract" to effect stated that the party was "truthful & would obey" the rules. Unregulated mess of what is going on makes it hard for "Legal Stations to Operate"!

A point of sale "Multi-Part" post card application, with no fee, with "Contract" like signature block for end users would be help put the user on notice. That the FCC is out there and the fine's and Jail time for serious violations do exist.

Call this a "permit" to **use** any of the unlicensed service if you wish, The FCC for general "PR [Public Relations Reasons] should consider some reasonable and "Cheep" service regulation.

The publications "PR could list the fines, and some of the most serious cases that have brought on "Jail" and/or "Fines"!

The "FCC reduced field enforcement staff, and the double up of FCC district field offices and the "Closing" of manned monitoring station to save "Funds" Saved the commission lots of funds! But enforcement of the areas is so "Thin" it would be like having only one "Ambulance" to take care of all the "Auto" accidents in D.C. / Virginia / MD each 24 hour period.

The "New H F station, and the "Remount" un-manned monitoring stations are working well that, but with out "Field Enforcement" officers it like having only one Traffic Cop for the "DC Belt way" Per Week!

Funds have to be found, and used for some serious areas of enforcement and intelligence!

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**RECEIVED**

**MAR 18 2003**

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

Thanks,

Dale E. Reich  
141 North Center St.  
Seville, Ohio 44273 - 9504

Telephone (330) 769-3071 + lots of rings for Machine - Long Walk to Phone also

ak437@mail.acorn.net

exab8fq@hotmail.com

Help STOP SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE"

**CC:** KM KJMWEB



EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
ORIGINALRECEIVED  
ORIGINAL  
MAR 18 2003

From: dale reich  
To: Mike Powell  
Date: Thu. Mar 6.2003 7:50 PM  
Subject: Report of "Threat Against the President of the United States " VIA HAM RADIO

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hello:

Yesterday a multi-segment "copy" of a "Tape" of "Communications" that took place over the Medina County M2M Amateur repeater system was given to the office of "Pat" Guisman, Medina County Commissioner, Ohio.

This tape had a "Segment" in which a "Ham" from Medina County stated of sorts, a long time "R", was not happy with the "Bush" energy policy's. In the "Broadcast" he states to the effect to locate the president and "BACK SLAP HIM! At best this may only be a "Civil Protest" however in all facts of truth it's a "Threat" against the President of the United States. Which can be a "Crime" even if a "Joke".

It is also a "Crime" in Ohio, and under my past "Oath's". not to report this [Current Oath's] also not to report this. So Above is my report.

Using "Ham" radio to make a "Threat" against the "president of the United States" should have some action the COMMISSION should also be aware of in normal business.

Please feel free to Contact Me, for any information you may need. You May also contact the Medina Commissioners, 144 North Broadway, Medina, Ohio 44256 as they have a copy of the TAPE.

This Tape has various of "Political" remarks directed at various public officials in Medina County by various Licensed Ham Radio Operators. Under Communications Act of 1934 Code 605 or new revised Title 47 Code Section 705, Ham Radio Communications and Citizen Band are not protected by the various privacy and secret act's.

There is a lot of Civil Protest listed, on this tape [Both Sides] and a number of "Radio Pranks" that have take place on the M2M ham radio club repeater that is supported by the Medina County Government through the Medina County Emergency Managenecy, The Federal NOAA Skywarn Program and various other related community projects in joint operations with the RED CROSS.

Comments that have civil protest have "Just Cause", This "Threat to Back Slap" the President is just a long string of "Civil Right" and "Federal" Violations, supported by the un-wise communications.

Copies of the Tapes went to "Key Democratic" County leaders, as they may find it funny how political attacks are "Broadcast" over the "Free" airways in Medina County on 147.030 Mhz. 51.660 Mhz, and 444.925 Mhz. In all fairness, The Medina County Government has "Supressed" the political wrong doings of this "Supported group of Hams.

You cant be "Threatening the President", and in the next few days be conducting FEMA / EMA / EOC business acting in the good intent of the public. A lack of oversight, a lack of control, and a un-willing to act local government to "stop" this kind of conduct is the problem.

With Respect,

Dale E. Reich  
141 North Center St.  
Seville. Ohio 44273 - 9504

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

Telephone (330)769-3071 + lots of rings for machine if not home. No "ooo" "ppp" or "Blocked Calls".

**CC:** Business Attorney  
"Others"

-----  
**STOP MORE SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE\***

**CC:** ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RM-10641

From: dale reich  
To: Mike Powell  
Date: Wed, Mar 5.2003 3:22 PM  
Subject: RM-10641 - Updates/ Remarks .... Gun's & Radios

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hello:

Well I've take a lot of "Flack" from the "Ham" & "C B Community about RM-10641 involving the point of sales & tagging of radio equipment.

I spent several hours from one caller from the west coast who had strong "objections" to both of my RM's that have been posted. This fellow used the "F word" in his communications about every 20 th word or so! I have no objection to his "F word" in print, oral communications from anyone using it. [Over the Broadcast Media, or Involved in Radio/TV] I do have objections to its use.

This fellow who was highly upset that his "RM were not acted upon, was shocked as How Easy I could get my "RM's past the "Commissioners & Bureau Chiefs's of the FCC. with out being sent back

He spent most of the time speaking of my GRAMMAR, and SPELLINGS as I have a "Small to Severer" "H Handicap in communications, and this is nothing new to me. The fact that I use a Library Computer and the "Spell Check will not work on all the terminals also upset him. The Library "Filters" block access to functions, some time will not work, and other time's lose DRAFTS of messages.

This fellow hammered upon me for more than 2 hours about my "RM, but my goal in talking to him was to find out his "Gripes". The fellow who would not calm down, stated I mixed up past history a bit, and also mixed it with my future proposals in the "RM request for changes. Well "History has a point of VIEW and all people don't see history as a "Fluid for of "Solid Science" of TRUTH, or FACT.

Searching this fellows remarks from what little I could pry out his "Hate" for the "Commission" and any thing that would abridge his 4th Amendments Rights to Have Gun's or Radio's! Makes Me think of his "Convolutud judgment. This fellow should have addressed my rite's under the 1st & 5th Amendments [For or Against] a issue.

This fellow ask if I had any other "RM that were pending, and I told him I would suspect that there are about 13 or so on the desk marked "Hold [By the commission] that are wide request issues to bring back some control of a out of control or non-controlway the WTB and other FCC bureaus have so "Deregulated radio that the "Commission" failed to protect the public with a pattern of non-enforcements! [OF SORTS]!!!

I told him that some of the not posted or not pending "RM's" setting on hold were far to complex to ever pass! This fellow demanded I have them "RECALLED and not posted he was upset! I told him I don't expect recall them, and gave him a outline of some of the items.

He did not have kind word for Mr. Riley "William" Hollingsworth, Gettysburg Office, enforcement chief of Part 90, 95, 97 and other sub-parts of the Licensing Bureau of the FCC.

I told him of the "Enforcement" issue that the FCC was engaging in by returning my complaints, as well of "Scores" of other Complaints that the commission has not the Money, or Time to address. Several rounds of over the air complaints including operators from 80 through 10 meters who "stuff" has been returned, and not acted upon. The commissions "Token Enforcement" program is at present "Cost Effective" they feel as if it is "adequate", however in not logging the complaint with a "Case Number" and returning it looks as if the "FCC Staff is doing a BANG UP JOB, and every ones happy. This is far from the TRUTH.

No. of Copies rec'd /  
List ABCDE

With Regards to the "RM-10641" perhaps the commissioners could consider this request to be applied to "Selective" enforcement area of the need-ed radio services that requires remedial enforcement protection of the public's need's!

With Respect, Thanks

Dale E. Reich  
141 North Center St.  
Seville, Ohio 44273 - 9504

Telephone (330) 769-3071 + Lots of Rings long walk to phone.

---

Protect your PC - Click here for McAfee.com VirusScan Online

**CC:** ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us